DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 807 HE 004 449

TITLE	Uncommon Means for the Common Task.
INSTITUTION	Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 72
NOTE	53p.; Conference proceedings of the 1972 Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, Washington, D.C., February 2-4, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Church Related Colleges; Conference Reports; *Educational Objectives; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Private Colleges

ABSTRACT

This document presents the papers and proceedings of the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America's annual convention, 1972. The theme was chosen to underscore the need for cooperation among the Lutheran institutions of higher learning and to provide a vehicle for discussion of new developments in college-governmemt relations, current trends, and legislation. Two speeches are presented regarding the methods and goals of Lutheran colleges and a discussion of whether private church related colleges are truly private colleges. Following the presentations conference material is presented. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078807

UNCOMMON MEANS FOR THE COMMON TASK

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 449

Papers and Proceedings, 1972

Lutheran Educational Council of North America

ED 078807

UNCOMMON MEANS FOR THE COMMON TASK

Papers and proceedings
of the 58th Annual Convention
Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

Statler Hilton
Washington, D. C.
February 2 - 4, 1972

LECNA

The Lutheran Educational Conference of North America traces its history to 1910, making it possibly the oldest inter-Lutheran organization. It was reconstituted in 1967 for its predecessor, the former National Lutheran Educational Conference.

The purpose of the Conference is to consider problems in higher education, especially those related to Lutheran higher education. Further, it seeks to share information, suggest strategy, and assist member institutions in their programs.

LECNA functions as a free forum in which representatives of Lutheran institutions of higher education, boards, organizations, and individuals discuss the problems and concerns of Lutheran higher education, collegiate or theological.

The papers and proceedings which follow are the product of LECNA's 58th annual convention, held for the second year in succession at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington, D. C. This meeting, as that of 1971, was self-standing and not allied to the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges as previous meetings had been since early post-World War II years.

The theme "Uncommon Means for the Common Task" was chosen to underscore the need for cooperation among the Lutheran institutions of higher learning and to provide a vehicle for discussion of new developments in college — government relations as well as to hear prominent spokesmen of government comment on current trends and legislation.

Robert L. Anderson
Editor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Means and Ends	ALBERT G. HUEGLI	5
How Private are Church-Related Colleges	EDGAR M. CARLSON	10
58th Annual Program		26
Program Highlights		29
Report of Secretary-Treasurer		39
Recommendations from Board of Directors		45
Report of the Committee on Resolutions		46
Board of Directors, 1972		47
Institutional Presidents		48
Record of Conventions and Officers		50

MEANS AND ENDS

ALBERT G. HUEGLI
President
Valparaiso University

Working together, Lutheran institutions of learning can share their special strength and reinforce their grasp on their unique objectives in a society which tends today to push every school into a single mold.

The year 1971 will be remembered as a watershed year in the modern history of higher education. We may expect that its events will significantly affect Lutheran colleges and universities for many years to come.

Everyone realizes by now that within the past twelve months the climate on the campus has changed. The student activism and commotion about causes in the late 1960's and in 1970 have given way to privatism, uninvolvement, and quiet introspection. There are many reasons for the change in the student mood, and no one should imagine that all problems are resolved. With student help our colleges have made changes that were long overdue, both in curricular and social life. Economic stringency imposed new restrictions on student options. The possibility of working through the system has become much more attractive.

The 26th amendment, which gave the vote to 18 year old Americans everywhere on June 30, 1971, represents a new opportunity for the student population. The levers of power in a democracy were put into their hands. We shall see in this presidential election year how effectively the newly enfranchised voters use political instruments for change. More important, perhaps, than the vote itself is the adult status which young people have thereby acquired. In one state after another, legislative changes are being made to accommodate with public recognition the claim to maturity which the eighteen year old vote implies.

We are only now beginning to see how profound the effects of this change can be on our campuses. Regulations regarding the personal lives of students who are considered adults will differ from those governing minors. The idea of "in loco parentis" is surely gone, even on our campuses. We shall need to explore more fully what it means to be "our brother's keeper."

In another area, 1971 made a lasting impression on all of us with the handing down of the Supreme Court decision in the case of **Tilton V. Richardson.** A year ago at our conference we had speculated about what that decision would be. Now we know — the federal funding of our college building construction was held constitutional, but we can never use those buildings for religious purposes. Furthermore, there is the shadow of a doubt cast over our eligibility as church colleges to receive federal funds in the form of institutional grants.

Until that doubt is cleared up, we shall continue to wonder whether we can look to the government for help in our financial dilemma, even if the House and the Senate of the U. S. Congress get together on a bill. It is highly significant that both houses took action on higher education legislation near the end of 1971 which would allocate funds to the colleges for the cost of instruction. This was a breakthrough of no small proportions. Should such a law finally emerge from conference committee deliberations and be funded, the future of many private schools now facing desperate measures may be reassured. We cannot be certain that colleges and universities with strong church ties like our own will be among those qualified for such assistance, and even if we are, we may not really want to pay the price which will be expected for receiving the grants. But if we do not get this kind of financial help, the plight of some of our members could become most serious.

Last year was also the year in which we bumped up against reality in enrollment. For the first time in a decade we had to be content with a leveling off in the number of students who sought our services in the fall of 1971. There were individual exceptions, of course, and enrollment was up in certain departments and down in others. But private four-year colleges and universities barely held their own in enrollment, and the numbers of first year freshmen may actually have declined among us.

We need not go into all reasons for this turn in the enrollment trend. It has been obvious for a long time that we are losing out in the competition with the state institutions for our share of the students, simply on the basis of the tuition gap. But 1971 taught us the sobering lesson that we cannot either raise tuition endlessly or look to increasing our student bodies as a way out of financial problems. Indeed, we now face the prospect of competition with each other as well as with public colleges and universities to stay where we are, or we must cut back sharply in all of our educational services.

There were other events that happened in 1971 to make the year exceptional. The new economic policy of the President, for example, freezing wages and prices, left its mark on us. The growth of the collective bargaining movements among the private college faculties, with government approval, got under way. In almost all of these developments of 1971 we might make the observation that they generally increased the involvement of our colleges in the directives, legislation, and decisions of government. Our institutions will therefore have to be much more sensitive than ever to their own identity, purpose, and mission.

The program which has been prepared for this conference reflects the importance for us of some of the events which have taken place since the last meeting of LECNA. We shall hear about them from people in government and from the Church. The problem of the relationship between Lutheran church colleges and public policy will be explored, and the way in which Roman Catholic higher education confronts the contemporary challenge will be outlined for our edification.

We shall all be especially interested in the proposals for strengthening our common efforts. Dr. Gamelin's stimulating analysis of last year, in which he outlined the pattern of higher education in the Lutheran Church, will be the focus of our attention. We should consider various recommendations for future action which follow from his study. It is time for us to reach some decisions. Working together, Lutheran institutions of learning can share their special strength and reinforce their grasp on their unique objectives in a society which tends today to push every school into a single mold.

The Lutheran Educational Conference of North America is the oldest inter-Lutheran organization we have. It brings a proud tradition of service to its members. Perhaps its opportunity to assist our institutions and the Church as well was never more clearly evident than now. LECNA could go on being a gathering of Lutheran educators, enjoying fellowship, exchanging pleasantries, and listening to speakers. Or, it can become a vigorous expression of mutual interest and concern which leads to dramatic efforts to make the impact of Lutheran higher education felt. This session of our conference will probably determine which way we shall go. One thing is clear from recent developments around us: whatever we are to do, we shall need uncommon measures to achieve our goal.

In its recent history, LECNA has been fortunate in the staff services which makes its progress possible. Dr. Gould Wickey and Mr. Howard Holcomb provided for our needs in the Washington office with outstanding success. When the time came to replace Mr. Holcomb last year, we were fortunate to secure the talents of Reverend Robert Anderson. He began his duties on August 1, 1971, and with his previous experience in the academic world as well as in Washington, he soon demonstrated his value to our organization. Reverend Anderson is our Secretary-Treasurer, but he is actually, as you know, the Associate Secretary of the Division of Educational Services of the Lutheran Council, U.S.A. We are grateful to the Council, to Dr. C. Thomas Spitz, and Dr. Donald Herb for engaging Reverend Anderson, and giving him as part of his duties the responsibility for LECNA. Reverend Anderson is surely one of the uncommon means by which we can hope to move our program forward.

Our task, as I see it, is to assert the interest and the faith of the Church in higher learning. Our colleges are the place where the church bodies with which we are affiliated can meet their young people. On our campuses we become acquainted with what the rising generation is thinking and striving to attain. And we have the opportunity to undergird their learning with the eternal wisdom of God. Our faculties and students look at issues which are important to the Church. Through the disciplines they seek not only knowedge for itself, but new ways of improving life, reflective of the will of God.

Lutheran colleges, therefore, have to be much more than liberal arts schools, careful to give attention to the needs of individuals. They must be clearly dedicated to the Truth which makes men free indeed, and to the preparation of young people for the calling of service to their God.

This is no small undertaking. Everything pushes us into a different direction. As we look around, we see that year after year church colleges look more like private colleges and private colleges look more like public colleges. If we are to be Lutheran in our identification, we have to see very clearly what it is that sets us apart for our special task. Through LECNA and every other device, we can make our contribution to the work of higher education distinctive, effective, and rewarding.

Someone recently pointed out that the theme of our times is the sanctity of all life. Respect for institutions, presidents, high office, and status has declined. The worth of the individual, wherever

found and whatever his position, is all important. It is if the new generations of men were hearing once again the voice of the Lord who speaks about concern for "the least of these my brethren." In such a setting the colleges of the church have their open door of opportunity. They ought to follow God's summons to be lively means in achieving His extraordinary ends.

How Private Are Church-Related Colleges?

EDGAR M. CARLSON

It would be a gross error to surrender to the Court the determination of educational philosophy and definition of purpose for church-related colleges.

The invitation to address the Lutheran Educational Conference came to me over the signature of Howard Holcomb about ten months ago and specified that I should speak on "the effect of the U. S. Supreme Court decision on constitutionality of federal aid to church-related education, specifically **Tilton** v. **Richardson** which should be announced within the next few weeks." That was April 16. The decision was reached on June 28. Since then Mr. Holcomb has become deeply involved in the public arena — as indeed he was already through his chairmanship of the fund for the four colleges involved — and I would guess that he could give this lecture with at least as much authority as I can. All of us have had the benefit of the very excellent analysis made for the Association of American Colleges by Charles H. Wilson, Jr., one of the defense attorneys in the case. It has also been my good fortune to have been engaged since the decision in a project dealing with public policy and church-related institutions in which I enjoyed the tutelage of Professor Paul Kauper, distinguished constitutional law professor from the University of Michigan. You would undoubtedly have been wiser to have enlisted one of these gentlemen as your guides through this legal terrain, but I have never allowed the existence of more qualified people to deter me from accepting assignments.

Let me first build a modest scaffold from which to interpret and appraise the Court decision. It is characteristic of the theologically trained to ask first about the premises and the context in which questions are asked. I shall not disappoint that expectation but the questions and contexts to which I shall refer are not theological ones. It is not a theological principle that requires some degree of institutional separation between church and state; it is a political principle. The church has in fact lived under a variety

---

Edgar M. Carlson is Executive Director of Minnesota Private College Council, St. Paul, Minnesota, and former president of Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota. Dr. Carlson's address was the third annual Lina R. Meyer Lecture.

of formal relationships with government, ranging all the way from persecution through state-church and church-state to free church to open hostility again. It would be foolish to imply that each of these relationships is equally good or equally favorable, but the church was not less church when it was persecuted than when it controlled the emperor, and the fact that it controlled the emperor did not necessarily prevent it from being the church. It was certainly subject to a host of temptations under either of those circumstances — and indeed under any others — but I would think the fact that the church and the gospel and faith could and did exist under these diverse conditions would strongly argue that the separation principle is not a sine qua non of the church's existence. It derives rather from a political principle which was written into our kind of government. The decision that all men should be free to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience had as its corollary the First Amendment, which provides that

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

This limitation of powers assured that there would be free churches existing side by side. At least part of the motivation for the limitation of powers was to prevent one free church from gaining precedence or priority over another. It was thus not only a question of the relation between the government and the churches but also a question of the relations between the churches. This principle of neutrality has been invoked again and again in legal history. However, the only point which I want to establish here is that the question about church-state relations is a question about political matters rather than about religious or theological matters.

A second point which needs to be made in establishing this scaffold or platform for viewing the issues in **Tilton** v. **Richardson** is that there appears never to have been a time when the line of separation was clearly drawn in the field of higher education. The popular assumption is that things were strict once and they have become progressively lax; they were clear and they are becoming confused; once church-related colleges went about their business and government went about its business and their paths did not cross. That seems not to have been the case.

Historians of education have considerable difficulty classifying schools as public or private in the colonial period. Harvard received

money from both private and public sources. One writer says "the very idea of a clean line of separation between 'private' and 'public' was unknown before the end of the eighteenth century."[1] There is that somewhat embarrassing — for the 'purist' at least — declaration in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, that "Religion, morality and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Several of the early state constitutions included similar assertions and early legislation provided for grants of land both for schools and for religious purposes. This was true also in New York State, whose later "Blaine Amendment" was to be used as a model for many restrictive mid-western and western state constitutions. A study of nineteenth century college finance reported in the **Harvard Education Review** (Spring 1961) documents the rather large injections of state funds into private institutions in that century. Among the recipients of such grants were Bowdoin, Columbia, Dickinson, Hamilton, Harvard, Union, Williams and Yale. There were also extensive state loans to church-related colleges to tide them over the difficult middle decades of that century.[2]

There appears to be little doubt that there was a shift away from this supportive role around and after the middle of the nineteenth century, that it was focussed at the elementary and secondary level of education, and that it was motivated in no small part by rising anti-Catholic sentiments. Such litigation as did occur related almost entirely to these lower levels. The only significant litigation involving colleges in the 19th century, is the Dartmouth case in 1819, which established the independence of private institutions from government control. What was at issue here was not so much the necessity of being separate as the right to be separate.

Congresswoman Edith Green has reminded us that the federal government has never made any distinction between public and private higher education. This tradition goes back, she says, to the Morrill Act of 1862 signed by Abraham Lincoln. She cites the case of Brown University which was then a Baptist college, with strong ties with the church, as one of two church-related institutions designated as Land-Grant Colleges.[3]

Nonetheless, I think one may have to blame the Land Grant Act of 1862 for having set in motion forces and policies which would in time lead to a radical distinction between the public and private sectors. It established a form of subsidy — grants of land — which could only go to institutions, rather than students; it gave

great impetus to the development of state universities, many of which assumed the agricultural and mechanical assignment contained in the Act. The on-going support of this vast complex of higher education became mainly a state burden, where constitutional provisions were generally more restrictive, to be carried by institutional subsidies, where the constitutional restrictions were most potent.

One other item should be underlined before we go to the case itself. The Connecticut case was the first case to come to the U. S. Supreme Court in which the issue of federal grants to church-related institutions of higher education was being tested. All the cases previously considered had involved elementary and secondary schools. The precedents had been established and the definitions forged out of these earlier cases. The uncertainty involved in this case was not only the question about the adequacy of those precedents and definitions at the level for which they were intended but also the question of the parallelism that might or might not exist between these lower levels of education and higher education.

The following analysis of the Court decision draws heavily on the Wilson report previously referred to.[4] Quotes are from the syllabi released by the Court.[5] Prior to this decision, the Supreme Court had developed an interpretation of the Establishment Clause setting forth several criteria.[6] The first was the "child-benefit" concept. This was developed in the case of **Everson v. Board of Education** (1947), the New Jersey school bus case. The Court held that to withhold such benefits from children and to expose them to the hazards of modern traffic on religious grounds would be to assume an "adversary position" over against religion, not a position of neutrality. To avoid such a position, benefits properly claimed by children could not be withheld because the children attended a religious school. It may be worth recalling that this was a 5-4 decision and that it contained a warning that the transportation subsidy was on the "verge" of unconstitutionality.

The second criterion, enunciated in this case and firmly established in subsequent decisions, is "neutrality." In awarding welfare benefits the state may not discriminate against citizens "because of their faith or lack of it." In **McCollum v. Board of Education,** the Court invalidated an Illinois law which permitted religious instruction in public school facilities, and in **Zorach v. Clauson** upheld a New York law permitting "released time" religious instruction off the premises. The crucial test in each instance was the question of neutrality.

A third criterion was developed in the devotional Bible reading case, **Abington School District v. Schempp** (1963). It may be viewed as a further qualification of the neutrality criterion. It is referred to as the "purpose and primary effect" test. If either the purpose or the primary effect is "the advancement or inhibition of religion then the enactment exceeds the scope of legislative power as circumscribed by the Constitution." There must be a "secular legislative purpose and primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion." On this basis devotional Bible reading in the schools was ruled unconstitutional.

This test assumed that it was possible to separate religious and secular purposes and effects. The case in which the test was used had a negative outcome, since it only determined that this was not an instance of a separated and legitimate secular purpose and effect. But in **Board of Education v. Allen** (1968) the Court found that providing free textbooks to all New York students, including those who attended private schools with religious affiliations, was constitutional and was addressed to a legitimate secular activity in these schools. It may be noted that this was the first case since **Everson** (the school bus case) twenty years earlier, that had involved a question of finance. It was an important case because it clearly and emphatically rejected the position that "the entire educational process of church-related schools is so permeated with religion that aid to any part of that process constitutes impermissible government support for religion."[7] It declared that schools perform both a religious and a secular function and that the secular function, to the extent that it can be isolated, may properly enjoy public support.

A fourth criterion came into prominence in **Walz v. Tax Commission** (1970). This was a challenge to the constitutionality of tax exemption for church property. By an 8-1 vote the Court found such exemption constitutional, but the Chief Justice, Warren Burger, in writing the opinion seemed to shift away from the central focus of "purpose and primary effect" and wrote, "We must be sure . . . that the end result — the effect — is not **excessive government entanglement with religion."**[8] Tax exemption was not subject to that hazard, but the principle was clearly a volatile one when applied to the whole field of education. Most of us, I think, gave only passing notice to the decision, and to the extent that we took note of it were probably encouraged by the support which it gave to the principle of tax exemption for church properties. This brings us to the decisions which are our particular concern.

The higher education community would have much preferred to have the issue of federal support for church-related colleges settled separately, rather than as a part of a package involving elementary and secondary schools. Instead the Court decided to hear two cases involving state programs and church-related elementary and secondary schools with the Connecticut colleges case involving the federal Higher Education Facilities Act. I suspect that certain assumptions about the nature of the issues and the nature of education are involved in that "lumping together" of cases, but there is little purpose to be served in speculating about them. Neither is it possible to judge with any certainty as to whether this association was in fact advantageous or disadvantageous to the case of the colleges. A distinction was drawn, to be sure between higher education and other levels — and perhaps this is considerable gain — but the grounds on which the distinction was made do not convert very easily into slogans for church college Sunday. The Court used the two cases to further define its criteria for interpreting the Establishment Clause, and I would suppose that the decisions striking down the Pennsylvania and Rhode Island legislation will turn out to be more "historic", in the sense of "precedent setting", than will the decision upholding federal grants to church-related colleges for construction purposes. We must look briefly at those decisions since they are inextricably bound up with **Tilton v. Richardson.**

The Pennsylvania case **(Lemon v. Kurtzman)** involved the reimbursement of nonpublic schools from public funds for the cost of providing students secular instruction in mathematics, physical sciences, modern foreign languages and physical education, specifically excluding "any subject matter expressing religious teaching, or the morals or forms of worship of any sect." In Rhode Island, **(DiCenso v. Robinson)** the program provided 15% supplementary payments to teachers in nonpublic schools, teaching courses being taught in the public schools, using materials in use in the public schools, and providing that the per pupil costs for secular education did not equal or exceed the per pupil costs at public schools.

The Court, with only one justice dissenting, held both programs to be unconstitutional in their application to parochial schools. They were not invalidated with respect to other private schools. The majority opinion, written by the Chief Justice, focusses on three tests that must be applied: "First, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second its principal or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion . . ., finally, the statute must not foster an excessive government entanglement

with religion."[9] The Court agreed that the legislature had a secular purpose but found it unnecessary to decide whether the primary effect was secular or not, since the legislation clearly involved "excessive government entanglements." Thus the "entanglement" concept moved to the center of the argument and appeared to become the crucial test.

The Court's objective in using the test is declared to be "to prevent, as far as possible, the intrusion of either (government or religion) into the precincts of the other."[10] It is readily admitted that "the line of separation, far from being a 'wall', is a blurred, indistinct and variable barrier depending on all the circumstances of a particular relationship."[11] Three factors are singled out to be taken into account in determining whether excessive entanglement is likely to follow: They are "the character and purposes of the institutions which are benefited, the nature of the aid that the State provides, and the resulting relationship between the government and religious authority."[12] When these tests are applied to the Pennsylvania and Rhode Island cases they are given much greater specificity. For instance, the presence of religious pictures and symbols in the school, the staffing by religious orders wearing religious garb, the necessity for legislated restrictions regarding what the teacher could or could not teach, and the continuing administrative relationships that would be required for supervision and control are all regarded as indications of the sort of entanglement which would be in conflict with the First Amendment. Moreover, and this is not a minor element, the Chief Justice saw the probable development of divisive political trends associated with the enlargement of program and the increase in appropriations. Thus, there was danger that communities would divide on political issues along lines that were basically religious.[13]

When the above three tests were applied to four Connecticut colleges and the Higher Education Facilities grants, the court upheld the law by a 5-4 margin. We are justified in saying that this is the narrowest of all possible margins, especially when we note the conditions attached to Justice White's affirmative vote. Only three other judges associated themselves directly with Chief Justice Burger's rational, Harlan, Stewart and Blackmun. Justice White concurred in the decision but dissented from the negative actions taken in the Pennsylvania and Rhode Island cases and in that dissent took sharp exception to the logic of the opinion in the Connecticut colleges case. We shall examine some of this at a later point. Justice Douglas wrote the dissenting opinion,[14] concurred in by Black and

Marshall, with a separate opinion submitted by Brennan.[15] The Douglas opinion acknowledges no distinction beween elementary and secondary education and higher education and refers consistently to "parochial schools" whether the context indicates the respective state programs or the Higher Education Facilities Act. It is sufficient to establish that religion is in some way to some extent aided by the public program in order to establish unconstitutionality. With respect to these grants it is acknowledged that "The public purpose is, to be sure, furthered by the program. Yet the sectarian purpose is aided by making the parochial school system viable. The purpose is to increase 'student enrollment' and the students obviously aimed at are those of the particular faith now financed by taxpayers' money."[16] It is further argued that determining what courses of instruction are eligible to be taught in a federally financed building may indeed involve the government in extended and excessive entanglements. Justice Brennan would have limited the ruling of constitutionality only to non-sectarian institutions. He would have "remanded" the case for review as to whether these four colleges were or were not sectarian institutions. This would not necessarily be a negative vote on the issue as it related to these colleges or any other which might be brought to trial. To this extent one of the four negative votes may not really have been negative in the end. To balance this, however, one should note the postscript in Justice White's statement to the effect that "if the evidence in any of these cases showed that any of the involved schools restricted entry on racial or religious grounds or required all students gaining admission to receive instruction in the tenets of a particular faith" he would hold that "the legislation would to that extent be unconstitutional."[17]

The Burger analysis of **Tilton v. Richardson** begins with the acknowledgement that "we can only dimly perceive the boundaries of permissible government activity in this sensitive area of constitutional adjudication." Each new case must be reviewed in the light of the "cumulative criteria developed over many years" in a wide range of governmental actions on which decisions have had to be made. His comments respond to four questions, which are as follows:[18]

1. Does the Act reflect a secular legislative purpose?
2. Is the primary effect of the Act to advance or inhibit religion?
3. Does administration of the Act foster an excessive government entanglement with religion?
4. Does the implementation of the Act inhibit the free exercise of religion?

The answer to the first question is affirmative: the only support necessary to establish that fact is the preamble of the Act.

The answer to the second question is negative: the primary effect of the Act is not to either advance or inhibit religion. It may be significant that while this was the particular and clear emphasis of **Board of Education v. Allen** (1968), the Chief Justice reached back to an 1899 case, **Bradfield v. Roberts,** which upheld a federal construction grant to a hospital operated by a religious order, for evidence. "The simplistic argument that every form of financial aid to church-sponsored activity violates the Religion Clauses was rejected long ago",[19] he said, in citing the case. There would appear to be at least two positive elements in that referral: 1) he gives the weight of a relatively long and continuing tradition to the position and 2) he accepts a parallelism between health institutions and educational institutions which may suggest greater latitude for public support of education.

In developing this answer, the Chief Justice followed rather closely the position which the Court has taken with respect to "purpose and primary effect." "The crucial question is not," he says, "whether some benefit accrues to a religious institution as a consequence of the legislative program, but whether its principal or primary effect advances religion."[20] The Act was carefully drafted to ensure that the federally subsidized facilities would be devoted to the secular and not the religious function of the recipient institutions. This directive has been complied with, so far as can be determined from the evidence. The appellants did not offer contrary evidence. They rather rely on the argument that "government may not subsidize any activities of an institution of higher learning which in some of its programs teaches religious doctrines." This position "depends on the validity of the proposition that religion so permeates the secular education provided by the church-related colleges and universities that their religious and secular educational functions are in fact inseparable."[21] This was clearly not the view of the Congress, which debated the question and found these arguments unpersuasive. The institutions have carefully adhered to the restriction against using the facilities constructed for any prohibited purpose (religious instruction, training, or worship).

In this connection, the Chief Justice focusses attention on the way in which religion may properly be taught without violating the constitutional provisions. The Court accepted the parties' stipulation "that courses at these institutions are taught according to the academic requirements intrinsic to the subject matter and the in-

dividual teacher's concept of professional standards."[22] This was accepted even though the appellants had introduced "institutional documents which stated certain religious restrictions on what could be taught" because other evidence showed that these restrictions were not in fact enforced and "that the schools were characterized by an atmosphere of academic freedom rather than religious indoctrination."[23] Adoption of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure endorsed by the AAUP and the AAC supported this contention.

In one respect the law was judged to be unconstitutional on the ground that its operation would enhance religion, and that was with respect to the 20 year limitation on the federal interest in the facility. The restriction against the use of the facility for religious instruction, training, or worship is now for the life of the facility.

With regard to the third question — the matter of excessive involvement — the Court decision may be least decisive and most vulnerable. As we have noted, it was the crucial issue on which the Rhode Island and Pennsylvania programs had fallen. The defense for a different outcome in this case is essentially an argument about the difference between elementary and secondary education,[24] on the one hand, and higher education on the other. Students are different — "less impressionable and less susceptible to religious indoctrination." The nature of course materials and instructional methods "tend to limit the opportunities for sectarian influence by virtue of their own internal disciplines." The objectives are different, inasmuch as they seek "to evoke free and critical response from their students and are characterized by a high degree of academic freedom." The four institutions involved fitted into this general pattern and had this general character. This was true despite the fact that all four "are governed by Catholic religious organizations, and the faculties and student bodies are predominately Catholic", and all four "require their students to take theology courses." They did not require students "to attend religious services" and they did not "attempt to indoctrinate students or to proselytize." The fact that courses in religion are taught "according to the academic requirements of the subject matter and the teacher's concept of professional standards" was the decisive matter. The fact that some courses in religion were taught by rabbis was a positive factor.

In view of all this "the necessity for intensive government surveillance is diminished and the resulting entanglements between government and religion lessened."[25] It is lessened also by "the

nonideological character of the aid which the government provides" — more like bus rides or text books than the payment of teachers. It is lessened also by the one-time character of the grant, which gives a terminus to the involvement, except for the very minimal supervision required to check on compliance. No one of these considerations alone would be decisive, said the Chief Justice but together they "shape a narrow and limited relationship with government which involves fewer and less significant contacts than the two state schemes before us in **Lemon** and **DiCenso.**"[26] They also limit the probability of divisiveness along religious lines in the political arena.

The fourth question, as to whether the Act inhibits the free exercise of religion, is given short shrift. In effect; if the payment of bus rides and textbooks does not do so, neither will libraries and art buildings.

Justice White, who concurred in the decision on **Tilton v. Richardson,** did not accept the above rational, specifically as it related to entanglement.[27] It appears to have been enough for him that an important and separable secular function was being supported. While he did not directly declare the entanglement issue to be irrelevant, he did point out the "insoluble paradox" which is created by the Burger rationale. "The State cannot finance secular instruction if it permits religion to be taught in the same classroom; but if it exacts a promise that religion not be so taught — a promise the school and its teachers are quite willing and on this record able to give — and enforces it, it is then entangled in the 'no entanglement' aspect of the Court's Establishment Clause jurisprudence."[28]

Wilson has given a very thoughtful analysis of the implications of the decision. It is hardly possible to address oneself to the same task without covering most of the same issues. He believes that the distinction between higher education and elementary and secondary rests principally on the difference between their susceptibility to religious indoctrination and that this is a very vulnerable position. Students vary in their degree of maturity. Teaching religion courses in these facilities would have been per se unconstitutional whether or not they had any effect on students, and the logic could make institutions with the least success in achieving their educational goals the most promising applicants for federal funds. The entanglement test and its rationale introduces three variables which must be separately examined with reference to each case. They are: 1) the character and purposes of this particular

church-related college, 2) the form of aid involved, and 3) the administrative relationships that ensue between the institution and the government agency. Wilson considers the first of these to be the most troublesome. The Court did not specify the features which distinguish eligible from ineligible institutions. It only determined that four colleges whose cases were before it were eligible. There is also the matter of the cumulative pattern of characteristics to be considered. In certain combinations one element might shift the balance to the side of unconstitutionality while in another combination the same element would be acceptable. There is also the diversity in the actual relationship between the church and the church-related college. All of this adds up to uncertainty in applying the outcome to any other institution or other program.

Wilson feels that the plaintiffs won a good deal in **Tilton v. Richardson** because they got the Court to agree that the character of the institution was a decisive factor, in distinction from the character of the function or program being supported. A decision that would have followed more directly the line taken in **Schempp** (1963) and **Allen** (1968) which focussed on the "secular purpose and primary effect" would have greatly lessened the prospect of future litigation. Comparability of programs is a more simple question than comparability of institutions.

A matter which may be of considerable practical importance is the extent to which the framework of the decision will incline administrative officials to caution in determining when institutions are eligible and when they are not. If an institution is held to be ineligible by a program administrator there will still be redress through the courts, but that can be a long and cumbersome course. Wilson believes "the administrator will really be the adversary of the church-related college in the search for sectarianism; but he will also be the evaluator and the judge of the facts leading to a college's disqualification."[29] This observation has received impressive documentation in the litigation which has gone on in New York State to force the Commissioner of Education to change his ruling on eligible recipients for Bundy aid. Canisius College and Iona College have sued on the basis of discrimination. After getting favorable decisions in two courts, the Canisius ruling has now been overturned by an Appeals Court.

Nonetheless, the **Tilton** case offers a number of concrete guidelines which will undoubtedly be respected by lower courts. The attitude and atmosphere of the Burger opinion is much more positive and sympathetic than is the opinion in the **Horace Mann** decision

dealing with the Maryland colleges. Among the factors which the Chief Justice noted specifically and which may be considered as criteria of the absence of sectarianism are: 1) persons other than Catholics admitted as students and appointed to faculty, 2) attendance at religious services not required, 3) religion courses not limited to the Roman Catholic religion, 4) no effort by the college to proselytize, 5) adherence on the part of the colleges to established principles of academic freedom.

It seems to me that it is permissible to draw a couple more conclusions from this case. One is that there is no evidence that church-relatedness as such is ruled out. All of these institutions were clearly church-related, they were "governed by Catholic religious organizations". This was not a factor of consequence in the minds of the majority of the Court. Neither was the fact that courses in theology were required. Whatever risk may have been entailed in that requirement appears to have been fully off-set by the fact that the theology courses were "taught according to the academic requirements of the subject matter and the teacher's concept of professional standards." I would therefore share Mr. Wilson's caution against precipitate dissociation on the part of the colleges such as was occasioned by the Horace Mann decision in some institutions who "tended to become as non-religious as possible" and in the process "unnecessarily shed important aspects of their religious affiliations."[30]

Before concluding I should like to speak briefly to the effect of the decision in our churches and their relationship to their colleges. A review of several of the Lutheran church papers reveals little reaction in the official press. There are references to the case in news sections and the **Lutheran Standard** for September 7, 1971, carries an article by Professor Paul Kauper entitled "The Supreme Court Speaks." It is a descriptive and analytic report, with the depth and incisiveness which one would expect from him. He seems to feel that the point at which Lutheran colleges might be most vulnerable would be with respect to admissions and hiring practices. If in either of these areas religious affiliation is a factor, there may be a question as to how the Court would rule. I would suppose that faculty selection would be the one where institutions might wish to take into account commitments which could be interpreted to be sectarian.

An article in the **Lutheran Forum** for November, 1971,[31] by Charles M. Austin, undertakes to interpret the decision in relation to the LCA Board of College Education and Church Vocation's statement on "The Mission of the Church College." This is supple-

mented by quotations from an ALC pastor writing in **Christianity Today** and a number of miscellaneous quotations from college presidents. It is his judgment that if the LCA statement had been submitted to the Court it "would have made a juicy point in the case of those opposed to such aid." This because the document declares the goals of the church-related colleges of the LCA to be "intellectual growth, Christian life and learning, service to the Church and social responsibility" and because they recognize that "spiritual growth is an essential part of their total educational mission." This appears to the author to be in marked contrast to the findings of the Court that "religious indoctrination is not a substantial purpose or activity of these church-related colleges." He failed to point out that the Chief Justice readily acknowledged that the defendant colleges were "institutions with admittedly religious functions" and this did not negate the fact that their "predominant higher education mission is to provide their students with a secular education." There is no inhibition against the teaching of religion in the decision, as long as it is pursued in accord with "the academic requirements intrinsic to the subject matter and the individual teacher's concept of professional standards." The question of whether one can in fact distinguish between secular and religious functions in the detail which any legal decision may assume is undoubtedly open to question. It is well to bear in mind that there is definite rejection of the position that no "religious" benefit can accrue, and that, moreover, the concern seems to be principally with benefit accruing to a religious institution, more than a "religious" outcome with respect to a student. "The crucial question is now whether some benefit accrues to a religious institution as a consequence of the legislative program, but whether its principal or primary effect advances religion."

When this writer implies that the Court decided in favor of the four colleges because they believed that they had no "Christian" influence on their students, I think he is drawing an unwarranted conclusion. Indoctrination does not constitute the sole kind of influence which can occur. The odd reference of the Chief Justice to the absence of evidence that "religion seeps into the use of any of these facilities" should probably be let stand without comment. Even legal language is sometimes figurative and I have great difficulty trying to visualize what kind of substance could "seep" into buildings which could properly be labeled "religion."

It is, however, possible to draw the sort of inferences which Mr. Austin draws and we ought not to be surprised if we encounter such

interpretations on occasion from persons in the churches. It would be a gross error to surrender to the Court the determination of educational philosophy and definition of purpose for church-related colleges. Indeed, it is hardly the domain of the Court to establish the philosophy and purpose of public education either. It would be most unfortunate if our institutional purposes and programs were to be shaped by court decisions, particularly by one which, however important it may be, certainly does not answer any more questions than it raises. We should not overlook the large number of federal and state programs of support which include private colleges and their students which have not been challenged in the courts. This includes the whole range of programs providing financial assistance to students, the various types of categorical aid, the National Science Foundation and the Foundation for the Humanities and the Arts, and rapidly developing programs in many states which either provide directly for the needs of the colleges or relieve them of burdens which they would otherwise have to bear.

In summary and in conclusion, a few specific:

1. We do now know that federal grants to "non-sectarian" colleges for educational purposes are constitutional.
2. We have at least examples, and some hints, of what eligible non-sectarian colleges are like.
3. We know that "governing" relationships are not decisive. Colleges may qualify even though they are "governed" by religious organizations.
4. Required courses in religion are no barrier if taught as academic subjects.
5. Required religious worship probably is such a barrier.
6. The limits in using religious criteria in admissions and in hiring staff are indefinite but probably are restrictive.
7. Federal and state financial aid programs for students should avoid unnecessarily restrictive guidelines and administrative procedures that involve the government in the operations of the colleges.
8. In view of the two-price system as it has developed in higher education in this country ways must be found to channel some significant measure of public support to private institutions to reduce their reliance on student charges. Caution and care must be exercised in the design and operation of such programs, not only to assure constitutionality but also to maintain the greatest amount of freedom for the institution.

FOOTNOTES

1. Bernard Bailyn, **Education in the Forming of American Society** (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960), p. 11, of pp. 107-109.
2. Frederick Rudolph, "Who Paid the Bills? An Inquiry into the Nature of Nineteenth Century Finance", **Harvard Education Review,** Spring 1961.
3. **Congressional Record,** Nov. 3, 1971, H 10312.
4. Charles H. Wilson, Jr., **Tilton v. Richardson, The Search for Sectarianism in Education** (Washington: Association of American College, 1971) (Cited as **Wilson)**
5. Syllabus, **Lemon v. Kurtzman,** June 28, 1971. (Hereafter cited as **Lemon)** Syllabus, **Tilton v. Richardson,** June 28, 1971. (Hereafter cited as **Tilton)**
6. These cases are summarized in **Wilson,** p. 7-13.
7. **Wilson,** p. 11
8. **Wilson,** p. 13
9. **Lemon,** p. 8
10. **Lemon,** p. 9
11. **idem**
12. **Lemon,** p. 10
13. **Lemon,** p. 18
14. **Tilton** (Douglas) 8 pages. **Lemon** (Douglas) 17 pages.
15. **Lemon** (Brennan) 20 pages.
16. **Tilton** (Douglas) p. 3
17. **Lemon** (Brennan) p. 2
18. **Tilton,** p. 5
19. **idem**
20. **Tilton,** p. 6
21. **Tilton,** p. 7
22. **Tilton,** p. 8
23. **idem**
24. **Tilton,** p. 12f
25. **Tilton,** p. 14
26. **Tilton,** p. 15
27. **Lemon,** (White) p. 4
28. **Lemon** (White) p. 7, 8
29. **Wilson,** p. 40
30. **Wilson,** p. 45
31. Charles M. Austin, "The Court and the Church Colleges: an Identity Problem", **Lutheran Forum,** Nov. 1971, p. 6.

"UNCOMMON MEANS FOR THE COMMON TASK"

58th Annual Convention

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2

4:30 p.m. Board of Directors Meeting

6:30 p.m. Board of Directors Dinner Meeting,
Michigan Room

6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
Registration, Upper Lobby, Statler Hilton

8:00 p.m. Congresswoman Edith Green (D-Oregon)
Chairman, House Special Committee on Higher Education
Massachusetts Room

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3

Federal Room

9:00 a.m. Devotions
President Paul D. Mork, Waldorf College

9:15 a.m. President's Report
President Albert G. Huegli, Valparaiso University

10:00 a.m. Coffee Break

10:15 a.m. 3rd Annual Lina R. Meyer Lecture
"How Private Are Church-Related Colleges: An Appraisal in the Light of **Tilton v. Richardson**"
Dr. Edgar Carlson, Executive Director
Minnesota Private College Council

11:00 a.m. Discussion of Carlson Presentation

11:45 a.m. Announcements

12:15 p.m. Luncheon, Senate Room
"Problems of Religious Oriented Higher Education"
Father Robert Henle, President
Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

2:00 p.m. Cooperative Ventures in Lutheran Higher Education
Dr. Francis C. Gamelin, Executive Director
Central States College Association
(Updated observations on "Toward A Master Plan," 2nd Annual Lina R. Meyer Lecture)

Respondents:

Dr. Elwin D. Farwell, President
Luther College, Decorah, Iowa

Dr. Arthur M. Ahlschwede, Executive Secretary
Board for Higher Education
Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod

Mr. Norman Fintel, Executive Director
Board of College Education
American Lutheran Church

Dr. Louis T. Almen, Executive Secretary
Board of College Education & Church Vocations
Lutheran Church in America

General Discussion

3:30 p.m. Coffee Break

3:45 p.m. Mr. Norman Fintel, Board of College Education
American Lutheran Church
"Attitudes Toward Lutheran Church Colleges"

4:15 p.m. Dr. Louis T. Almen, Board of College Education & Church Vocations, Lutheran Church in America
"Proposal for a Lutheran College Union"

5:00 p.m. Announcements

6:30 p.m. Dinner Meeting, Pan American Room

Address: "The Reformation in Modern Man"
President Kent S. Knutson
American Lutheran Church
Music, Students, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4

8:00 a.m. White House Tour

South American Room

9:00 a.m. Devotions
President Paul D. Mork, Waldorf College

9:15 a.m. "Grant Coordination Resources on Campus"
Mr. Joseph Kane, Associate Director
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities

10:15 a.m. Special Address
The Honorable Peter P. Muirhead
Executive Deputy Commissioner
U. S. Office of Education

11:15 a.m. Annual Meeting
Secretary-Treasurer's Report
Election of Officers and Directors

Noon Adjournment

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

(Editor's note: Due in part to the increased costs of printing and in part because of the unavailability of complete texts for some of the presentations, not all of the addresses delivered at the 1972 annual meeting are included in the **Proceedings.** Realizing that any summary of a prepared address truncates the presentation, an attempt nevertheless is made in the following summaries to give something of the chief thoughts of these addresses, with the hope that the reader may catch a bit more of the flavor of the sessions of this year's meetings. Should a more complete version of any of the addresses of which we have a text available is desired, a copy may be secured for the cost of photo-copying.)

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Keynote Address: Congresswoman Edith Green, Chairman, Sub-Committee on Higher Education, House Committee on Education and Labor

Mrs. Green discussed the status of the pending Higher Education Act and the prospects of moving the bill through a conference committee in time for funding this year. She also discussed the three main thrusts of the House version of the bill and pointed out the differences in this version from the Senate and Administration concepts.

The first of these thrusts is a new emphasis on vocational and technical education. Mrs. Green stated that there was probably more support for this type of education in Congress than any other provision, especially in view of a Department of Labor study which pointed out that in the 1970's, less than twenty per cent of jobs would require the equivalency of a bachelor's degree. Mrs. Green took a dim view of open admissions policies which coupled with government loan policies put students in college who had no need to be there and little chance to finish or repay the loans. Resulting high default rates could jeopardize the whole NDEA and guaranteed loan programs. Better for these students to be in governmentally aided vocational and technical career programs.

The second thrust of the House bill, Mrs. Green explained, is a restatement of Congressional intent that student grant and aid programs should be administered on an individual basis and not reserved for one particular social economic group. She criticized Office of Education guidelines which place all of the emphasis on

the lowest socio-economic group and referred to the squeeze being placed on the middle income family. The House bill, therefore, gives the student financial aid officers on individual campuses latitude to consider individual needs, institutional costs, family reverses, etc. in developing a comprehensive financial aid package.

The third thrust of the legislation emphasized by Mrs. Green was the institutional aid formula of the House bill. She pointed to the great number of studies portraying the financial plight of colleges and universities and defended the House method of institutional aid built on a full time equivalency basis of credits earned and weighted for smaller schools. She stated her opposition to institution aid tied to federal grants charging that student aid is one of the most unstable factors institutions needing stability could be forced to use. Furthermore, there are many more types of aid than Federal, including state and private funds. Then, too, while much effort has been directed to help schools keep tuition low, versions of institutional aid based on student aid might well cause schools to raise tuition to get more aid, thereby increasing the squeeze on the other students. Finally, aid tied directly to a certain group of federally aided students might give them cause to use the aid accompanying their enrollment as a club to force administrators to yield to special demands they might make.

In discussing the other differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill, Mrs. Green argued against the establishment of a National Foundation for post-secondary education. She cited examples of inefficiency and mismanagement in Office of Education and criticized the evaluation techniques of this agency as well as the impetus its programs have given to a "grantsmanship profession." There is no reason, she stressed, to believe that a new foundation would operate any differently. How much better to give institutions enough funds so that they could develop innovation and change themselves according to the diversity of our higher educational system rather than being directed by a strong national board. Our schools have demonstrated their ability to innovate, but stortage of funds cuts these experiments short. Given the funds, the schools could do a much better job without government supervision or direction.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Luncheon Address: Father Robert Henle, S. J., President, Georgetown University

Father Henle discussed a number of factors that lie behind the difficulties and changes occurring in Roman Catholic institu-

tions in recent years, which he felt may also be relevant for those in Lutheran higher education.

The first of these is the shift in the American Catholic Church from what he termed Ghetto Catholicism to full American partnership. This took place at least in part because of the ladder to advancement provided by education. With this development discrimination has all but disappeared, and there is a new openness and mingling for catholics in the pluralistic society and pluralistic world of ideas.

A second development emerging after Vatican II is the shift from a rigidly defined situation marked by uniform practices, beliefs, and organization to a new situation characterized by spontaneity of freedom of emphasis on the individual conscience and the individual choice. This has affected such things as academic and religious requirements in the schools and has prompted a questioning about what is distinctive about a Catholic college or university. It has also promoted a fluidity of theology that makes dealing with student personal problems more complex.

A situation noted by many psychologists, that entering freshman today are at least two years more advanced than eighteen year olds of twenty years ago, has also had effect on Catholic higher education. The new student, if not possessed of more wisdom, at least has a much wider background in terms of learning and experience in the world and all that implies. Here are many profound implications for student life.

Recent years have also seen emergence of tensions on campus, one of which is that between a discipline-oriented faculty and the dedication of a religious institution to the human development of the student. Autonomous departments cannot completely take over the task of faculty recruitment if the broader purposes of the university are to be achieved.

There is also a tension at present between a certain view of objectivity and efforts to stay within a value context. "In a religious institution we ought to present a liberal education within a context of values." This does not mean indoctrination, but it does mean bringing attention to value questions with a notion of ideals and judgment of values. The Christian university should present the full range of Christian heritage and Christian belief not by imposition but "in such a way that students will be attuned to it, will listen to it, will want to enter into it."

The Christian university then must be concerned with how it presents its theology, that it put its best efforts here; it should be

concerned with interdisciplinary approaches, and with seeking to serve the religious needs and development of all its students regardless of denomination. And our religious institutions can also show a leadership towards a Christian unity which in face of world situation today can "enable us all to stand together without fighting each other."

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Banquet Address: "The Reformation in Modern Man" Dr. Kent Knutson, President, American Lutheran Church

The purpose of the address, as stated by Dr. Knutson, was to assist a clearer understanding of the role and character of the academic communities we call church-related colleges. More effective ways must be found to describe the distinctiveness of this kind of enterprise and to develop clear and more helpful relationships between church and college. For this purpose, Dr. Knutson spoke of the colleges as Christian communities engaged in a mission enterprise on the cultural frontier.

With this in mind he posed the question of identity for both Church and college and argued that Reformation theology in this context is viable for modern man.

As a prelude to his development of this thesis, Dr. Knutson commented upon three aspects of the methodology of Reformation theology, i.e. the source of authority for the faith, **sola scriptura;** "Luther's breathtaking reductionism;" and Luther's often misunderstood individualism.

The central development of Dr. Knutson's theme took the form of exposition of five central thrusts of Reformation theology:

— the humanity of man
— the immanence of God
— the secularity of the world
— the reality of evil
— the power of the future.

These taken individually and together speak to the condition of modern man as he is in this generation. They free him for hope and suggest a basis for activities "which might in another day have been called liberal arts," but which may just as well be called "a mission of the Church whereby the Church as a Christian community explores the cultural frontiers and prepares to engage itself in the world God not only has given us in which to live, but one which he has given us to serve."

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Special Address: "Grant Coordination Resources on Campus"
Mr. Joseph Kane, Associate Director, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities

Mr. Kane discussed the selection and function of a local campus grant coordination officer who can work in concert with a Washington based liaison office to maximize private college success in submitting successful proposals to governmental agencies. The value of such a locally assigned person is that he can be much more closely related to particular campus needs and particularities and can work in a much closer relationship with faculty and administrators who may be preparing proposals to submit.

The functions of such a grants officer are many and varied. He assists the local campus keep up with grants information, assesses shifts in program emphasis, helps his colleagues be aware of fund transfers from one program to another, and he can inform his colleagues of special slants or special criteria needed for a successful submission. The grants coordinator can read proposals submitted and assist editorially with their preparation. He coordinates campus approaches and campus application information to insure that background information about the school is consistant from application to application. He can maintain a library of successful proposals from the local campus as well as others and can assist faculty members in meeting with officials in government offices to gain additional needed information.

The grants coordinator can follow up on reasons for the rejection of a proposal so that the deficiences may be corrected in a re-submission or a subsequent proposal. And he can, because of his intimate knowledge of the goals and academic program of his own institution, help officials determine in advance what grant programs of his own institution, help officials determine in advance what grant programs will enhance this program and which might well change the character of the school if award criteria were followed. Some grants are bread-and-butter to private schools these days. Other are too expensive to accept. A local coordinator can help a school know the difference.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Featured Address: Mr. Peter Muirhead, Executive Deputy
U. S. Commissioner of Education

Mr. Muirhead, in his address, reviewed the thrust of federal aid to higher education since 1958 and the effect of this aid in

helping institutions to accommodate more than double the number of students during the decade of the 1960's. He noted the shift in policy from earlier years which saw federal aid directed to specific programs which largely reflected the Federal Government's own interest to one in which the importance of higher education as a broad, over-all priority of society in general and of young people and their parents in particular is recognized.

While noting that the Administration is aware of the financial plight of the private institutions, Mr. Muirhead defended the Administration goal of "equalizing educational opportunity" and the means selected to achieve the goal.

> We believe that institutional aid should be related to efforts that institutions themselves are making to help fulfill a national purpose. The aid at least for the time being, should carry through on the commitment the nation has already undertaken, such as equalizing education opportunities, stimulating reform and innovation, sponsoring research and encouraging specific programs that have served a national interest.
>
> Therefore, the Administration proposal for institutional reform has taken the form of a rather carefully qualified cost of education allowance tied to the college or university total federal student aid fund. That is done in clear recognition of the obvious burden imposed on institutions that educates significant numbers of disadvantaged students.

Mr. Muirhead also stressed the significance in Administration thinking of the proposed national foundation for post-secondary education. This foundation should be able to assist private institutions do what they can best accomplish — help students who do not fit into traditional molds, those less able to pursue traditional programs. Private schools within their position of autonomy, individuality, and independence, he stated, are on the cutting edge of reform, and should well be able to profit by foundation assistance to design and establish innovative structures and teaching methods and means of extending higher education to people of all ages and circumstances.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

COOPERATIVE VENTURES IN LUTHERAN HIGHER EDUCATION

(The afternoon session on Thursday, February 3, was devoted entirely to further consideration of ways in which Lutheran colleges

and universities might better cooperate with one another in their common task.)

DR. FRANCIS C. GAMELIN, Executive Director, Central States College Association:

Dr. Gamelin presented updated statistics and observations based on his Lina Meyer lecture of 1971 entitled "Toward a Master Plan." He pointed out that the reason for gathering the data was to make a more intelligent analysis of the past and present and to make predictions for the future based on what is actual in the present.

By way of summary of his statistical studies since the last meeting, Dr. Gamelin pointed out that 18 of the 45 schools included in the study are now on the 4-1-4 calendar. There was noted a trend to combine courses rather than establish new ones, although new majors were being established. He saw no movement toward a world view as a dominant motif to replace the traditional emphasis on western civilization.

Dr. Gamelin observed a slight decline in enrollment and a slight increase in faculty numbers. Senior schools vary in teacher-student ratio form 11:1 to 19:1. The junior colleges vary from 6:1 to 30:1. Salaries, surprisingly, he noted, are best at the professional level. Faculty salaries increased 14% in the last two years in the senior colleges and 9% in the junior colleges. Student charges are going up faster than faculty compensation and inflation. Total costs now vary for senior schools from $1590 to $3,400 and from $875 to $2,750 for junior colleges. Total income for the schools was $176 million contrasted with $174 million in expenses. Every category of income increased except church grants which declined 2%. Indebtedness in the year (1970-71) increased more than twice the rate of plant value and now equals 32% of plant value.

Dr. Gamelin reiterated the nine problems he had enumerated the previous year — duplicate location, institutional autonomy, Western orientation in course offerings, uncertainty of future academic patterns, indebtedness, mediocrity in certain aspects, governmental bias in student financial aid, rapidly increasing operating costs, and doubt concerning institutional identity. To meet these problems, Dr. Gamelin advocated again his proposals of a year earlier: establishment of a "Commission on the Future," and a "covenant" for genuine cooperation. He concluded by emphasizing that though these institutions have problems, they are basically in-

stitutions with a future, and that his statistical study "from the outside" have given him greater appreciation of these institutions.

DR. LOUIS ALMEN, Executive Secretary, Board of College Education and Church Vocations, Lutheran Church in America:

Dr. Almen presented highlights of a proposed Lutheran College Union featuring greatly expanded cooperation between the Lutheran institutions. He discussed the relationship of the Union to the "open university" and the "university without walls." He emphasized the values in having the schools develop a working organization for operational cooperation prior to any further talk of church body mergers, and of the need for cooperation with all educational segments of the Church to carry out the responsibilities of the educational mission in the parish, as well as among church boards and agencies.

Dr. Almen outlined the relationship of the proposed Union to LECNA. He saw LECNA as more of a forum while the Union would be more of a working group for planning and implementing specific activity. It would be a para-structure (along side of) rather than a sub-structure of the Church.

As he outlined the objectives of the Union, Dr. Almen pointed to it as a vehicle for the growing and working together process. He underlined that our institutions are now in jeopardy and that we must fight together for their existence.

MR. NORMAN FINTEL, Executive Secretary, Board of College Education, American Lutheran Church:

Mr. Fintel presented data from his recent doctoral studies based upon the "Study of Generations" data collected by Lutheran Youth Research, under the direction of Dr. Merton Strommen. This investigation was a stratified study of the members of all three major Lutheran Church bodies.

The question Mr. Fintel asked was, "What is the attitude of people in the Lutheran churches who support the colleges?" He considered a profile of who the Lutherans are, their personal and social characteristics and their general attitudes as well as their religious posture and attitude to the church colleges.

The purpose of the study was to provide a guide for policy makers in Lutheran higher education and to develop a base line for continued study of the attitudes of church members to these institutions.

Because there is no base line at present with which to compare the findings of the current study, it is not known if the attitudes are good, improving, growing worse, etc. But Mr. Fintel concluded that not all church members love us, neither do they hate us, and that the theological position of the individual is not as significant as one might have expected in determining which attitude a church member holds.

DR. ELWIN D. FARWELL, President, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa:

Dr. Farwell reacted to the Gamelin recommendations as well as the comments of Almen and Fintel. He posed the question as to why the schools have not moved more in the realm of cooperative work. The schools, he said, are wary of more bureaucracy, and administrative responsibilities. They are relatively satisfied with present consortium arrangements, which allow preservation of autonomy.

But what, he asked, are the possibilities for the future? Are there not ways we can work together in a geographical area to avoid excessive competition for funds and students? Perhaps external campus programs including international education are areas for greater common effort. Probably the less structure the better; the para-structure concept is appealing and should help the schools relate better to each other, to the Church, and to congregations.

DR. ARTHUR AHLSCHWEDE, Executive Secretary, Board of Higher Education, Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod:

Dr. Ahlschwede responded to the previous presentations by developing insights from within the experience of the Missouri Synod. He pointed to the difficulties in developing national policy and patterns of cooperation and stated that it would certainly be difficult to cross synodical lines in cooperative efforts if it is so difficult within a body.

He stressed that our chief interest as institutions should be in remaining Lutheran schools, and avoiding the danger of selling out goals and educational ideals to get the government dollar. He encouraged the examination of the suggested possibilities, however, because there are new and better ways than the past. Careful examination would lead us to work from plans rather than surprises.

In further comment, Dr. Almen emphasized that whatever is done in the way of cooperation, the church Boards of Higher Education should be facilitators rather than originators.

Mr. Fintel continued the discussion by pointing out that the church board secretaries may best serve as resource locators. He stressed that new organizations and new ways of cooperation cannot come from the top down, but initiative, if it is to be productive, must come from the schools themselves.

The

ANNUAL REPORT

of the

SECRETARY - TREASURER

LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

OF NORTH AMERICA

Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D. C. February 4, 1972

This report of 1971 LECNA activities is the fourth annual report provided through staff services of the Division of Educational Services of the Lutheran Council in the U. S. A.

SECRETARY - TREASURER

During the year there was the first change in the position of Secretary-Treasurer since LCUSA has been providing staff services for the Conference. At the 1971 LECNA annual meeting, Mr. Howard E. Holcomb announced that earlier in the week he had tendered his resignation to the Lutheran Council to accept a position with the Association of American Colleges. Mr. Holcomb graciously agreed to continue to serve as Secretary-Treasurer of LECNA until a successor could be elected. He met with the Board and commenced initial planning of the 1972 annual meeting and has continued to serve as friend and adviser to the new Secretary-Treasurer both before and after his arrival in Washington. The Rev. Robert L. Anderson, on the staff of Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois, was elected by the Executive Committee of LCUSA to succeed Mr. Holcomb in April. He was selected by a special ballot of the LECNA Board to succeed Mr. Holcomb in June, and began work in Washington on August 1.

MEMBERSHIP

In terms of official status, there were no changes in membership during 1971. Three schools which have previously indicated interest in membership by paying dues declined to do so during the year, but have not indicated a desire to cease membership. Therefore, there remain in membership 31 four-year colleges, 12 two-year colleges, five church boards of college education or theological education, and the LCA Deaconness Community. Membership remains open to seminaries, but by their decision, they no longer pay

dues nor meet with the Conference. As the LECNA constitution provides, one member-at-large of the Board of Directors continues to represent a Lutheran Seminary.

BUDGET

The financial report for 1971 is attached to this report as Exhibit A. The report shows the budget adopted by the Board of Directors at the March 17 meeting and the actual expenses and receipts for the year.

ENROLLMENT

Exhibit B comprises an enrollment report for October, 1971, of the Lutheran colleges and universities as collated by the Office of Research, Statistics, and Archives of LCUSA, under the direction of the Rev. Edward A. Rauff.

Consistent with trends across the nation indicating difficulty for private higher education both in terms of numbers of students and finances, Lutheran colleges showed a slight decrease in total enrollment this year. Statistics show a decrease of 305 students for the four year colleges (a net loss of .58%) and a decrease of 96 students (a net loss of 1.65%) for the junior colleges. Total fall enrollment for all the schools is 57,698, still a sizeable portion of students in the nation. These figures must also be considered in view of the fact that a number of our institutions have stabilized growth within the past few years and seek to become no larger.

PRESIDENTS

Members of LECNA have been saddened by the sudden death of two member presidents in the past few weeks. Dr. William A. Poehler, recently retired president of Concordia College, St. Paul, Minnesota, and interim president of California Concordia, died in early December, at the home of his daughter, just after attending a meeting of LC-MS presidents. Dr. Paul G. Elbrecht, president of Concordia Lutheran College of Austin, Texas, died of an apparent heart attack at his home January 16 of this year.

Presidents retiring during the year included Dr. Raymond M. Olson, California Lutheran; Dr. C. C. Madsen, Dana; Dr. A. G. D. Wiles, Newberry; Dr. Albert E. Meyer, Concordia-Bronxville; and Dr. Lambert J. Mehl, St. Paul's.

Dr. Maurice Knutson has become the acting president of California Lutheran. New presidents, some of whom are yet to be

inaugurated, include Dr. Harvey A. Stegemoeller, Concordia — St. Paul; Dr. Earl R. Mezoff, Dana; Dr. Fredric B. Irvin, Newberry; Dr. Willis L. Wright, Alabama Lutheran; Dr. Robert V. Schnabel, Concordia-Bronxville; and Dr. Walter Rosin, St. Paul's.

ANNUAL MEETING

Presenting quite a contrast to the previous annual meeting, there were 57 individuals registered for the 57th Annual Meeting, held at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Washington, D. C. 32 colleges and universities were represented. The program featured a number of speakers associated with government in official and representational roles. The Lina R. Meyer lecture by Dr. Francis Gamelin concerned the possibilities of Lutheran cooperation in higher education.

Because of the success of this meeting, the Board of Directors decided to again in 1972 hold a convention separate from other meetings in Washington, D. C. Advance registration shows that all except 8 four-year and 5 two-year colleges will be represented for a total of 38 persons representing 33 schools. In addition, all member church boards, one board of theological education, and representatives of fraternal life insurance societies, campus ministry, the Association of Lutheran College Faculties, National Lutheran Campus Ministry, and other interested individuals have indicated plans to attend.

YEAR'S ACTIVITIES

The court case **(Tilton v. Richardson)** involving four Catholic colleges in Connecticut, was argued before the Supreme Court and decided during tne year. Although the decision was ambiguous, at least a narrow majority declared the type of institutional aid involved was constitutional for the colleges considered. The Conference had contributed to the fund defending the cause of the four colleges. The financial support of the Conference and member institutions and the participation of the Secretary-Treasurer in the Trust Fund activity which supported an **amicus curiae** brief on behalf of the colleges was a significant involvement of Lutheran higher education in what may be the most important area of decision (constitutionality of public support) for our schools in the years ahead.

The Secretary-Treasurer, functioning through the Division of Educational Services of LCUSA, continues to coordinate All-Lutheran College Days. Twelve of these events were held this year, with 547,882 pieces of literature going to 3,120 congregations and 1,434 high schools. He continues to coordinate Lutheran higher edu-

cation activities by reporting to the Lutheran deans' conference, serving on the executive committee of the Association of Lutheran College Faculties, and attending other meetings involving Lutheran college people. The Secretary-Treasurer continues to edit a periodic news bulletin, answer requests for information from member institutions, and represent the institutions in legislative and administrative as well as non-Lutheran educational organization circles.

Robert L. Anderson
Secretary-Treasurer

EXHIBIT A

LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

Financial Report

December 31,1971

I. INCOME	1971 Budget	1971 Actual
A. Balance on hand, January 1	$ 6,949.52	$ 6,949.52
B. Membership dues	3,945.00	3,548.50
C. Interest, Time Certificates	0.00	112.50
TOTAL INCOME	$10,894.52	$10,610.52
II. DISBURSEMENTS		
A. Secretarial services	50.00	0.00
B. Office supplies	200.00	35.15
C. Duplicating & Printing	1,900.00	125.87[1]
D. Communications	100.00	133.55
E. Postage	150.00	270.30
F. Books & Subscriptions	0.00	175.00[2]
G. Board Travel	1,200.00	943.59
H. Annual Meeting:		
(1. Expenses, 1971 $2,280.20)		
(2. Registration fees −867.30)		
(3. 1971 net expense $1,412.90)	2,000.00	1,412.90
I. Organizational Memberships	155.00	155.00
J. Bulk Mailing Costs	100.00	77.63
K. Contingency; Misc.	200.00	0.00
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	$ 6,055.00	$ 3,328.99
III. BALANCE	$ 4,839.52	$ 7,281.53
Adjustment for book correction		+175.00[2]
Deferred Expense		−3,350.00[1]
Adjusted Balance, December 31, 1971		$ 4,106.53

LINA R. MEYER LECTURE FUND

Balance, December 31, 1970:	$5,550.74
Interest added during the year:	178.88
	$5,729.62
Disbursed to Francis Gamelin, 1971 Lina R. Meyer Lecture	−500.00
Balance, December 31, 1971	$5,229.62

[1]By decision of the Board of Directors, the entire presentation by Dr. Gamelin last year was printed in the **Proceedings.** This caused a considerable increase in printing, but because of disagreement over the bill presented, the expense was deferred, and has now been paid.

[2]By error, the expenses represented by "F" were charged to the LECNA account rather than a Lutheran Council/USA account. LECNA has now been credited with this amount, but so that the balance in this report agrees with the LC/USA balance for our account at the end of December, it is printed here as an expense and an adjustment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

LECNA Board of Directors to LECNA

February 4, 1972

1. That appreciation be expressed to Dr. C. Thomas Spitz, Jr. (General Secretary of LCUSA) and Dr. Donald W. Herb (Executive Secretary, Division of Educational Services, LCUSA) for their participation in securing the Rev. Robert L. Anderson as replacement for LECNA in the position of Secretary-Treasurer.
2. That LECNA extend official greetings to the presidents of the Lutheran seminaries along with an expression of interest and hope that the seminary presidents may soon again join with the colleges in LECNA meetings.
3. That LECNA authorize the Board of Directors at its next meeting to prepare a budget for LECNA for 1972.
4. That LECNA establish the same rate of dues for 1972 and 1971:

   $100 — four year colleges
   50 — two year colleges
   25 — church boards
   5 — individual members

   And that the Board review the dues structure at its next meeting, after having sought advice from member institutions with respect to the financial situtation of the Conference.
5. That the annual meeting of LECNA next year be held in conjunction with the meeting of the Association of American Colleges in San Francisco, January 14-16, with LECNA sessions beginning on the Friday prior to the convening of AAC or NCICU and continue through Saturday and possibly Sunday morning.

Adopted at annual meeting, February 4, 1972

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

58th Annual Convention

1. Resolved:

That the Board of Directors implement the concept of a Commission on the Future in order to focus light from history, current experience, and futuristics upon Lutheran aspirations and plans in higher education, and that they report periodically the findings and recommendations to . . . LECNA in a form transmissible to individual colleges and church bodies;

2. Resolved:

That . . . LECNA express its indebtedness to Francis C. Gamelin for the stimulating and thoughtful presentation of his study of the Lutheran Colleges and for his work in gathering all of the materials included in the report including the exceedingly valuable statistical compilations.

3. Resolved:

That the Secretary of . . . LECNA be directed to formulate on behalf of the Conference, appropriate expressions of appreciation for

1) The valuable services of President Albert G. Huegli
2) The program participants, whose presentations made this 58th annual convention a valuable and stimulating one.
3) The cooperation and helpfulness of the management of the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

4. Resolved:

That LECNA express its thanks for the conscientious work of our Secretary-Treasurer, Robert L. Anderson, with special gratitude for his role in the planning of this Conference.

Carl Fjellman
Thomas Langevin
Arthur Ahlschwede

As adopted at annual meeting, February 4, 1972.

5. Special Resolution from the floor:

Resolved:

That LECNA express its thanks to Howard Holcomb for his considerable efforts on behalf of LECNA after he left the employ of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., both during the office vacancy and after the arrival in Washington of the new Secretary-Treasurer.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Albert G. Huegli
President, Valparaiso University

Vice-President

Arthur O. Davidson
President, Wagner College

Secretary-Treasurer

Robert L. Anderson
Associate Executive Secretary
Division of Educational Services
Lutheran Council in the USA
Washington, D. C.

Members-At-Large

1972

Raymond M. Bost
President, Lenoir Rhyne College

Raymond M. Olson
President (1971),
California Lutheran College

John H. Tietjen
President, Concordia Seminary,
St. Louis, Mo.

1973

Frank R. Barth
President, Gustavus Adolphus College

Ralph J. Jalkanen
President, Suomi College

Joe K. Menn
President, Texas Lutheran College

1974

Raymond M. Bost
President, Lenoir Rhyne College

W. Theophil Janzow
President, Concordia Teachers College,
Seward, Nebraska

Charles M. Cooper
President, The Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary

INSTITUTIONAL PRESIDENTS
LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF NORTH AMERICA

FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

OSCAR A. ANDERSON, Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn.
CLARENCE W. SORENSEN, Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.
CHARLES L. BALCER, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. D.
ARVIN W. HAHN, Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kan.
MARK A. MATHEWS, Acting, California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks, Calif.
THOMAS H. LANGEVIN, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio
HAROLD H. LENTZ, Carthage College, Kenosha, Wisc.
JOSEPH L. KNUTSON, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn.
HARVEY A. STEGEMOELLER, Concordia College, St. Paul, Minn.
MARTIN J. NEEB, Concordia Senior College, Ft. Wayne, Ind.
MARTIN L. KOEHNEKE, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.
W. THEOPHIL JANZOW, Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebr.
EARL R. MEZOFF, Dana College, Blair, Nebr.
C. ARNOLD HANSON, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.
FRANK R. BARTH, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.
RAYMOND M. BOST, Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, N. C.
ELWIN D. FARWELL, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa
L. DALE LUND, Midland Lutheran College, Fremont, Nebr.
JOHN H. MOREY, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.
FREDRIC B. IRVIN, Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.
EUGENE W. WIEGMAN, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Wash.
PERRY F. KENDIG, Roanoke College, Salem, Va.
SIDNEY A. RAND, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.
GUSTAVE W. WEBER, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.
JOE K. MENN, Texas Lutheran College, Sequin, Texas.
CHAUNCEY G. BLY, Thiel College, Greenville, Pa.
CARL G. FJELLMAN, Upsala College, East Orange, N. J.
ALBERT G. HUEGLI, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.
ARTHUR O. DAVIDSON, Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y.
JOHN W. BACHMAN, Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa
FRANK C. PETERS, Waterloo Lutheran University, Waterloo, Ont., Can.
G. KENNETH ANDEEN, Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio

JUNIOR COLLEGES

WILLIS L. WRIGHT, Alabama Lutheran Academy and College, Selma, Ala.
WILBUR E. BARNETT, Acting, California Concordia College, Oakland, Calif.
K. GLEN JOHNSON, Camrose Lutheran College, Camrose, Alta., Can.
LEROY TSCHATSCHULA, Acting, Concordia College, Austin, Tex.
ROBERT V. SCHNABEL, Concordia College, Bronxville, N. Y.
ROLAND A. FRANTZ, Concordia College, Edmonton, Alta., Can.
WALTER W. STUENKEL, Concordia College, Milwaukee, Wisc.
ERHARDT P. WEBER, Concordia College, Portland, Ore.
PAUL A. ZIMMERMAN, Concordia Lutheran Junior College, Ann Arbor, Mich.
BERNT C. OPSAL, Golden Valley Lutheran College, Minneapolis, Minn.
ERNEST D. NIELSEN, Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa
MORRIS ANDERSON, Luther College, Regina, Sask., Can.
J. P. WORTHINGTON, Luther College of the Bible and Liberal Arts, Teaneck, N. J.
REUBEN C. BEISEL, St. John's College, Winfield, Kan.
WALTER ROSIN, St. Paul's College, Concordia, Mo.
RALPH J. JALKANEN, Suomi College, Hancock, Mich.
PAUL D. MORK, Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa

BOARDS OF EDUCATION

A L C
Minneapolis, Minn.

NORMAN C. FINTEL, Board of College Education, Executive Director
(VACANT), Board of Theological Education, Executive Secretary

L C A
New York, N. Y.

LOUIS T. ALMEN, Board of College Education and Church Vocations, Executive Secretary
E. THEODORE BACHMANN, Board of Theological Education, Executive Secretary

L C - M S
St. Louis, Mo.

ARTHUR A. AHLSCHWEDE, Board for Higher Education, Executive Secretary

RECORD OF CONVENTIONS AND OFFICERS

Convention	Place	Date	President	Vice-President	Secretary	Treasurer
1st	Harrisburg, Pa.	June, 1910	P. M. Bikle	L. H. Schuh	F. B. Sawvell	
2nd	Gettysburg, Pa.	April, 1911	J. A. Haas		F. P. Manhart	
3rd	Springfield, O.	Dec., 1912	C. G. Heckert		C. T. Benze	Prof. Martzoff
		For the Years 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1917 no records are available				
4th	Maywood, Ill.	Jan., 1916	J. Henry Harms	G. A. Andreen	H. D. Hoover	Otto Mees
5th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1918	G. A. Andreen		H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
6th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1919	W. A. Granville	L. A. Vigness	H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
7th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1920	L. A. Vigness	E. F. Pihlblad	H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
8th	New York City	Jan., 1921	E. E. Stauffer	H. W. Elson	H. D. Hoover	J. A. Aasgaard
9th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1922	H. D. Hoover		R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
10th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1923	Otto Mees	H. D. Hoover	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
11th	New York City	Jan., 1924	J. F. Krueger	J. A. Aasgaard	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
12th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1925	L. W. Boe	O. J. Johnson	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
13th	New York City	Jan., 1926	G. A. Andreen	C. O. Solberg	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
14th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1927	R. E. Tulloss	E. F. Pihlblad	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
15th	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1928	E. F. Pihlblad	J. N. Brown	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
16th	Chattanooga, Tenn.	Jan., 1929	J. N. Brown	W. P. Hieronymous	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
17th	Chicago, Ill.	Mar., 1930	H. F. Martin	G. A. Andreen	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
18th	Indianapolis, Ind.	Jan., 1931	H. F. Martin	G. A. Andreen	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
19th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1932	O. J. Johnson	Otto Proehl	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
20th	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1933	J. C. K. Preus	Wm. Young	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
21st	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1934	Wm. Young	C. Bergendoff	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
22nd	Atlanta, Ga.	Jan., 1935	Erland Nelson	J. Wargelin	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
23rd	New York City	Jan., 1936	H. W. A. Hanson	Arthur Wald	J. C. K. Preus	H. J. Arnold
24th	Washington, D. C.	Jan., 1937	Conrad Bergendoff	Mary Markley	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
25th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1938	Chas. J. Smith	C. M. Granskou	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
26th	Louisville, Ky.	Jan., 1939	C. M. Granskou	E. J. Braulick	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
27th	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1940	E. J. Braulick	J. C. Kinard	H. J. Arnold	
28th	Marion, Va.	June, 1941	J. C. Kinard	B. M. Christensen	H. J. Arnold	
29th	Baltimore, Md.	Jan., 1942	H. J. Arnold	V. K. Nikander	F. C. Wiegman	

RECORD OF CONVENTIONS AND OFFICERS, Continued

Convention	Place	Date	President	Vice-President	Secretary/Treasurer	
		1943	Omitted: War-time Restrictions			
30th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1944	H. J. Arnold	J. C. Kinard	F. C. Wiegman	
31st	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1945	B. M. Christensen	H. J. Arnold	F. C. Wiegman	
32nd	Cleveland, O.	Jan., 1946	C. G. Shatzer	E. Lindquist	H. J. Arnold	
33rd	Boston, Mass.	Jan., 1947	E. Lindquist	W. P. Hieronymous	H. J. Arnold	
34th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1948	W. P. Hileronymous	T. F. Gullixon	H. J. Arnold	
35th	New York City	Jan., 1949	J. N. Brown	H. L. Yochum	H. J. Arnold	
36th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1950	H. L. Yochum	L. M. Stavig	W. F. Zimmerman	
37th	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1951	L. Tyson	E. M. Carlson	W. P. Hieronymous	
38th	Washington, D. C.	Jan., 1952	E. M. Carlson	R. E. Morton	Orville Dahl	
39th	Los Angeles, Cal.	Jan., 1953	R. E. Morton	C. H. Becker	Orville Dahl	
40th	Cincinnati. O.	Jan., 1954	C. H. Becker	V. R. Cromer	Orville Dahl	
41st	Washington, D. C.	Jan., 1955	V. R. Chomer	O. P. Kretzmann	Orville Dahl	
42nd	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1956	O. P. Kretzmann	C. C. Stoughton	Orville Dahl	
43rd	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1957	C. C. Stoughton	E. B. Lawson	Orville Dahl	
44th	Miami, Fla.	Jan., 1958	E. B. Lawson	I. W. Ylvisaker	Gould Wickey	
45th	Kansas City, Mo.	Jan., 1959	J. W. Ylvisaker	M. Neeb	Gould Wickey	
					Treasurer	**Secretary and Executive Director**
46th	Boston, Mass	Jan., 1960	M. J. Neeb	L. M. Stavig	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
47th	Denver, Colo.	Jan., 1961	L. M. Stavig	H. S. Oberly	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
48th	Cleveland. O.	Jan., 1962	H. S. Oberly	K. E. Mattson	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
49th	Atlantic City, N. J.	Jan., 1963	K. E. Mattson	A. O. Fuerbringer	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
50th	Washington, D. C.	Jan., 1964	A. O. Fuerbringer	P. W. Dieckman	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
51st	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1965	P. W. Dieckman	R. L. Mortvedt	Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
52nd	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1966	R. L. Mortvedt	A. N. Rogness	Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
53rd	Los Angeles, Cal.	Jan., 1967	A. N. Rogness	E. N. Jensen	Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
54th	Minneapolis, Minn.	Jan., 1968	E. Jensen	S. A. Rand	Howard Holcomb	Gould Wickey
					Secretary-Treasurer	
55th	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Jan., 1969	Sidney A. Rand	J. A. O. Preus	Howard Holcomb	
56th	Houston, Tex.	Jan., 1970	Albert G. Huegli	Sigvald Fauske	Howard Holcomb	
57th	Washington, D. C.	Feb., 1971	Albert G. Huegli	Arthur O. Davidson	Howard Holcomb	
58th	Washington, D. C.	Feb., 1972	Arthur O. Davidson	Elwin D. Farwell	Robert L. Anderson	